

1 2 3	PHILLIP A. TALBERT United States Attorney SAM STEFANKI Assistant United States Attorney 501 I Street, Suite 10-100 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 554-2700 Facsimile: (916) 554-2900		
5			
6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiff United States of America		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CASE NO. 2:20-CR-00213-KJM	
11	Plaintiff,	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S FURTHER MOTION TO DISMISS	
12	V.		
13	CHALONER SAINTILLUS,		
14	Defendant.		
15			
16	The United States of America (the "government") respectfully requests that the Court deny		
17	defendant Chaloner Saintillus's most recent efforts to dismiss the criminal charges against him.		
18	Saintillus's filings advance a meritless view of th	ne Court's jurisdictional power that should be	
19	summarily rejected.		
20	I. <u>FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND</u>		
21	Saintillus is charged by indictment with one count of conspiracy to distribute controlled		
22	substances and four counts of distributing controlled substances. ECF No. 5. These charges stem from		
23	Saintillus's distribution via the dark web of controlled substances such as heroin, oxycodone,		
24	oxymorphone, and fentanyl. ECF No. 1; ECF No. 5.		
25	On April 29, 2022, Saintillus filed a document captioned, "Motion to Compel Dismissal and		
26	Release." ECF No. 109. This most recent filing recycled a number of meritless claims Saintillus		
27	previously raised. For example, it purported to appoint the Court as settlor of a trust, which would		
28	ostensibly compel the government to "sign off on the dismissal and render [Saintillus's] release." ECF		

Case 2:20-cr-00213-KJM Document 111 Filed 05/06/22 Page 2 of 3

No. 109 at 1. Saintillus attached a number of documents to this filing, including his birth certificate, a document purporting to be an "Official Declaration-Proclamation of the Moorish American Nation, Our Status and Jurisdiction," and a declaration apparently intended to appoint the Court and the government's attorney as "successor trustee(s)/fiduciaries" which also demanded \$31 million in damages. ECF No. 109 at 6–86. Saintillus's filing also argued that the Court has no jurisdiction over him because "every single court [is] considered a seperate [sic] foreign entity." ECF No. 109 at 90. And it further asserted, among other things, that the Court is without jurisdiction over Saintillus because he enjoys sovereign immunity and because "all of the United States District Court are fraudulent in nature." ECF No. 109 at 92, 94.

10 ||

II. <u>ARGUMENT</u>

Saintillus provides no valid grounds upon which to dismiss the indictment against him. The Court should therefore deny his most recent motion and its various supplements.

A. The Court Has Jurisdiction to Preside Over This Case.

The Court has jurisdiction over this case because Saintillus is charged with a violation of federal criminal law and the "district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States." 18 U.S.C. § 3231. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California is a "district court[] of the United States," and hence has jurisdiction over violations of federal criminal law. *Id.* Since Saintillus is charged with just such a violation of the laws of the United States, the Court has jurisdiction over him and over the criminal case in which he is a named defendant. *See* ECF No. 5 (containing charged violations of federal criminal law). There is no reasonable basis to conclude, as Saintillus argues, that the Court is a foreign entity or somehow fraudulent. *See* ECF No. 109 at 90, 94.

Saintillus's other assertions are meritless and repetitive arguments derived from a so-called Moorish-American belief system that courts across the country uniformly reject. *See, e.g., Bey v. Gascon*, No. 19-CV-03184-WHO, 2019 WL 5191012, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 15, 2019) (collecting cases in which courts rejected Moorish-American claims to being outside federal district court jurisdiction). The Court should do the same here and emphasize to Saintillus that his repeated invocation of a nonsensical legal theory wastes the Court's time and resources.

1	III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
2	The Court should deny Chaloner Saintillus's most recent motion to dismiss. The Court has
3	jurisdiction over this case and should express that reality clearly to the defendant.
4	
5	
6	Dated: May 6, 2022 PHILLIP A. TALBERT United States Attorney
7	United States Attorney
8	By: /s/ SAM STEFANKI
9	SAM STEFANKI Assistant United States Attorney
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	